

that we can be about the business of writing good unemployment compensation law. I suggest, one more time, one more time, that we take off the Donnelley amendment, we permit the regular processes to work and depending upon the outcome of the regular processes we can approach this issue during the next legislative session. We can carefully examine the story involving all homeworkers, all marginally employed people, all persons who work less than a 40 hour work week, all people who receive minimum wage, or less, all persons who theoretically are labeled independent contractors and the like. But let us do that in light of some court interpretation of the so-called ABC test. Let us not rush to judgment ourselves without at least knowing what the law looks like as interpreted by our courts.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Were you through Senator Johnson? Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, a little while ago Senator Johnson said, John, how did you ever get on the opposite side of me on this? He said, don't you see the real issue? I said, Vard, I do. I think the real absolute truth and I really mean this in this particular case is somewhere in the middle and that middle has to be discovered and found this summer by Bill Barrett and the committee. But I believe that it is imperative you not put his amendment on at this time. Let me show you why. Let me show you the dilemma, where you destroy or injure the unemployment fund either direction A or direction B. So let's think back what kind of people we are talking about. We are talking about Bernice Labeledz and a group of people who work in their homes, most of whom earn less than a thousand dollars a year doing the envelopes and that kind of stuff, okay? Or the people she might have. That is the kind of group we are talking about. Now ask yourself, when are they unemployed? That is right, when are they unemployed? Remember the unemployment laws are designed for people generally who hold full time jobs. That is their whole purpose. If they are unemployed, if they are unemployed then they are entitled to compensation, right? If they are entitled to compensation that is going to be a drain on the fund. Now do you know any business that regularly has a hundred percent turnover in employees during a year? This particular type of business does. So does that mean a 100% of these people are going to be on unemployment and depleting and draining and completely destroying the purpose of the fund. That is option one. You destroy the fund because it was. . . it would be used as it was never intended. Okay, here is option two. Obviously since they are part-time workers, they can't really ever be unemployed, right? So really they are never ever going to be entitled